



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee
of the
Metropolitan
Planning
Organization
for the
Miami Urbanized
Area**

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau

Sheila Boyce

Dr. Barry Burak

Susan Kairalla

Amado Leon

Susan Smith

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator
davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW First St., #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-4507
(fax) 305-375-4950

www.miamidade.gov/mpo



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SOUTH MIAMI COMMISSION CHAMBERS
6130 SUNSET DRIVE
SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

A G E N D A

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2004
AT 7 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF JULY 21, 2004
- III. ACTION ITEMS
 - A. 2030 LRP NON-MOTORIZED ELEMENT – D. Henderson
- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT PRIORITIZATION – D. Henderson
 - B. METROBUS COMPLAINT PROCEDURE – D. Henderson
 - C. MPO WEBSITE – D. Henderson
- V. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDPW
 - B. GO BOND UPDATE – D. Henderson
 - C. JULY PROGRESS REPORT – J. Manzella
- VI. MEMBER COMMENTS

(NOTE: NEXT MEETING – SEPTEMBER 22, 2004)

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2004

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brett Bibeau
Susan Kairalla

Sheila Boyce
Ted Silver

Barry Burak
Susan Smith

Amado Leon

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff
Noel Cleland, Citizen

Jae Manzella, Staff

Jeff Cohen, M-DPW

The meeting began at 7:15 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- SB: <i>Motion to approve Minutes of July 21, 2004; seconded by SK; vote – unanimous.</i> TS: Made note that the recording error did not omit any critical discussion. B.Bibeau: <i>Motion to revise the last statement by him to declare only that “the previous month’s request for a Rickenbacker project timeline had not been provided.” He is pleased with JC’s attendance record. Seconded by SB; vote unanimous.</i>
2030 LRP NON-MOTORIZED ELEMENT	- DH: The MPO is responsible for a Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRP), as a federal requirement. Traditionally, it is a 20-year horizon; the MPO is moving ahead to assess Year 2030 needs. Usually, every 3 years the Plan is updated. During the 2025 Plan, a Non-Motorized Element was initiated; one section on-road projects, another off-road. TS: Cautioned new members that the term “greenway” does not always relate to off-road projects. Some greenways will be a combination of on and off-road facilities. DH: An example would be the Miami River Greenway, where the trail follows the riverbank; yet, at times, it will route users onto wide sidewalks and shared roadways. For the 2025 Plan, a consultant collected data on Miami-Dade’s major roads. This update focuses upon off-road projects. Previous studies have identified feasible projects. These were combined as the North and South Dade Greenway Networks; both done in the 1990’s. Most run along railroads or canals. A few other projects were added as well. (He handed-out an update to the Agenda’s map/spreadsheet.) A formula was developed to objectively prioritize the list of projects (approximately 150 miles), since there is a limited amount of funds. The evaluation criteria was developed by the consultant and the BPAC several meetings ago. This includes: connection to Metrorail/Park&Ride lots, # of schools/colleges/shopping centers within a mile of projects, total # of parks, and bike crashes. Crash data are from police reports, which do not represent all crashes; but, this is the only reliable source. Other criteria include: connections to existing paths, land use/density, as well as funding status. More crash-severity received higher scores; that is how some received fractions. All the scores are summed-up, grouped into 3 categories (high/medium/low); and, the costs are factored-in, using estimated costs (during project inception) updated to 2003-dollar values. The normal process of the LRP is to estimate how much revenue will be available, using gas tax, federal subsidies, ect. The MPO Governing Board adopted a policy to provide 1.5% of the total LRP Surface Transportation revenues towards non-motorized projects; (currently about \$70 million). Funding does not guarantee projects will be constructed. Today’s effort will be to review the projects, approve them as presented, or debate specific projects as to their merits and ranking. Projects listed in the Transportation Enhancements (TE) review are not shown, since they haven’t been approved by the MPO Governing Board yet. If approved, these

will advance the ranking of several projects listed. In addition, the Better Communities Bond issue is being voted upon in November; this would affect several projects, (as well as fund new ones). There is about \$15-20 earmarked for bike/greenway projects in the bond proposal. These include the Miami River, Indian Creek, Snake Creek and Snapper Creek greenways. These would be partially funded, if the “Parks&Recreation” and “Neighborhood Improvements” sections of the bond proposal pass.

BBibeau: Was under the impression that these were lumped into the Museum proposal.

DH: Museums were separated as a separate Cultural section. Although status may change, it is important to proceed with this review now. It is not unusual to make LRP amendments on an annual basis; so these can be revisited, based upon revenue changes. One factor not scored is the purchase of railroad property for some trail projects. Although the FEC (which most of these affect) is interested in discussing possibilities, these can be expensive. They include: Flagler, Ludlam, and Unity Trails; the latter of which ranks very high. It is possible to earmark some of the costs of right-of-way with these funds. Partial funding of the Ludlam Trail R-O-W purchase has been appropriated by Congress, the BC Bond and, perhaps, through TE funds. He asked if the BPAC felt this was an appropriate expenditure, and suggested \$10 million. This would shorten the list of funded projects; but, increase the chances for a R/R trail being constructed.

TS: Suggested that, when a member identifies a project ranking, the membership will discuss that particular project’s merits; and then move to the next project.

BBibeau: Inquired if all projects depicted on the map are listed in the spreadsheet.

DH: Funded/under construction/existing (grey) projects are not on the spreadsheet.

BBibeau: Portions of the Miami River Greenway that are depicted on the map as grey are not funded. He cannot identify where these are listed in the spreadsheet.

DH: He was under the impression that the entire Greenway is funded, east of Hwy 836.

TS: Funding status can be reviewed at a later date between DH & BBibeau; right now, he would prefer the debate to focus upon the merits of projects and their current rankings.

BBibeau: The Miami River Greenway Action Plan was adopted by the City of Miami and the County in 2001, as a continuous greenway on both shores from Biscayne Bay to Palmer Lake. The spreadsheet only lists it from Hwy 836 to Palmer Lake. This should be changed to “Biscayne Bay to Palmer Lake”.

DH: Several sections are already fully funded. Those sections are taken out of the spreadsheet, otherwise the evaluation would be skewed. He asked for clarification.

BBibeau: The south shore, from Brickell Av. to SW 2 Av. is unfunded.

DH: The section from Miami Av. to NE 2 Av. is a TE project he expects to be approved.

BBibeau: It has not yet been approved. From NW 12 Av to Hwy 836 is unfunded.

BBurak: There is only a limited amount of time; this meeting should only address projects the way they are listed on the spreadsheet. Alterations can be made later.

TS: Inquired what was the basis of this list, whether it can be amended.

DH: It can be amended without disruption of the matrix.

TS: Requested BBibeau to take a moment to summarize sections he is concerned with, in order for the BPAC to discuss their merits. He asked other members for comments.

BBurak: The most popular cycling route is the Commodore Trail. This should be ranked #1. Due to the high amount of ridership, this whole trail should be funded.

SB: Agrees; *those sections should be compiled as a whole project listing.*

TS: Agreed.

DH: There is an overlap of certain sections listed on the spreadsheet.

TS: Suggested ranking the Gold Coast Trail lower. As this is the 2030 Plan, there will be

opportunity to bring it up again, if conditions change, (such as potential use, R/R cooperation, etc.) This will allow potentially more-feasible projects to move up.

SB: Inquired as to the timelines of these projects.

DH: There is a big difference as to other projects in the LRP. The FDOT, Transit, etc. have the potential to get their projects done because they have the work force. The projects being reviewed today still need support by the Parks or M-DPW Depts. to implement them. However, many will be approved/completed before 2030. Some projects, like the Commodore Trail, have gone through a lot of scrutiny to their feasibility; others, like the Gold Coast Trail are only concepts. If it comes out as a high priority, then studies will be done to determine the feasibility.

BBibeau: Requested clarification on some numbers, for instance “Crashes”.

DH: The number of crashes within that 1-mile corridor buffer determines the score for that section of the spreadsheet. The table provided explains the breakdown of scores.

BBibeau: The south sides of the Miami River, from Brickell to SW 2 Av. and NW 12 Av. to Hwy 836 are not funded. Although he would like this corrected on the map, he is willing to accept the spreadsheet ranking of 5th.

SB: Inquired about the M-Path listed as SW 7 Av. to Mouth of Miami River.

DH: This is an error; it should be SW 7 “St.” The NDGP lists this as part of the M-Path Trail. This actually covers part of the section BBibeau was debating.

BBibeau: With that clarification, his concern is only from Metrorail to SW 2 Av., as well as NW 12 Av. to Hwy 836.

JM: Suggested that since the Perimeter Trail will be funded, (as agreed upon with Aviation Dept. staff as paved shoulders), it should be broken-up into sections.

JC: The Aviation Dept. has changed their view because of Homeland Security issues. The project to 4-lane Perimeter Rd. has been deleted, except for the entry near 15 St.

DH: Prefers to keep this project listed as it is to keep the project active.

TS: Suggested it should be ranked lower, in order to move projects that are more feasible up. Suggested the Black Creek Trail, from Krome Av. to L&P Thompson Pk, to be ranked higher. This could be a good east-west connection from Biscayne Bay to Krome Av. Inquired if the Krome Trail, listed on the bottom of the spreadsheet, is ranked low because of existing funding and R-O-W acquisition.

DH: No; it does not connect many schools, parks or future projected high-density areas.

SB: The Indian Creek Greenway would be a good connection with the Venetian Cswy. It should be ranked higher. The City is doing other work that should support it as well.

TS: Inquired as to the alignment of Merrick Trail.

DH: It utilizes the Coral Way Bikeway.

JM: It includes several “shared roads”.

DH: One of those is Granada Blvd. It is listed wrong in the spreadsheet; it ends at Sunset Dr. Inquired if the BPAC felt it appropriate to use LRP funds for R-O-W acquisition.

TS: Inquired if acquisition is ranked on the spreadsheet.

DH: No. Dollar amounts are too large for the budget. This is a separate issue.

TS: Acquisition is not a criteria, the BPAC ranks projects, not the need for acquisition, nor the cost estimate of projects. Realistically, the BPAC should take a hard look at those projects that are listed on the top of the spreadsheet, rather than debating costs for projects ranked low. Requested a recap of changes the group has mentioned so far.

DH: *Sections of the Miami River Greenway should be changed as to their funding status, as well as changing the name of the M-Path Trail section which resides along the Miami River; rank the Commodore Trail as a whole project, and correct the limits*

		<p><i>listed, rank Black Creek Trail high, from L&P Thompson Pk. to Krome Av. Any changes would also be reflected on the map.</i></p> <p>JM: TS also suggested lowering the rank of the Gold Coast Trail; and the Perimeter Trail should be listed as partially completed/existing.</p> <p>TS: Therefore, <i>Commodore Trail would be ranked high; the M-Path is sufficiently ranked, just the change in limits is proposed; Indian Creek and Black Creek Trails are to be ranked higher. Perimeter and Gold Coast Trails are to be ranked lower.</i></p> <p>DH: The BPAC does not have to find particular spots on the list to place these; just above or below the “Funded” \$70 million line.</p> <p>BBibeau: Indian Creek Greenway is only 2 points away from being a “High” priority. <i>Motion to approve the changes outlined; seconded by SB; vote – unanimous.</i></p>
TE PROJECTS	-	<p>DH: This should have just been an Information Item. These are the results from the various committees.</p>
BIKE&RIDE COMPLAINT	-	<p>TS: Included in the Agenda package is an explanation of how MDT handles complaints. <i>The Director will be attending next month’s meeting.</i></p>
MPO WEBSITE REVIEW	-	<p>TS: <i>Requested members to visit the website and submit any comments to DH.</i></p> <p>BBibeau: Since there are new members, <i>he would like an updated picture posted.</i></p>
PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS UPDATE	-	<p>JC: The Federal Hwy. Admin. has changed standards for bicycle facilities; so, the Rickenbacker project has to be revised. This should only take a few days. It will have to go back to the Contracts & Specifications Division. Funds are available and staff are eager to spend them this fiscal year.</p> <p>TS: Inquired about funding to install a higher railing on the north side of the bridge.</p> <p>JC: Staff is reviewing how much it would cost. The railing will be a bit different to what exists on the south side, because of the difference in the walls.</p> <p>DH: Perhaps the BPAC should review the new designs before proceeding.</p> <p>TS: Inquired if that slows the project significantly.</p> <p>DH: It would be more of an informational review, rather than comment.</p> <p>JC: Most of the changes are minor; for instance: marking a bike lane through an intersection has changed, signage has changed, and bike lanes are no longer diamond lanes. If railings can be installed as a segment of the project, then (shoulders) can be officially designated bike lanes. Old signs obligating cyclists along a certain route have been removed. Signs will be installed preceding right-turn bays, warning motorists to yield to cyclists. He is reviewing connecting the off-road paths in Crandon Pk., which are presently disconnected by the parking lots. Some roadway bulb-outs will be cut-back.</p> <p>BBibeau: The BPAC never received a timeline for this project, as requested.</p> <p>JC: He was under the impression that a formal request would be submitted to his office. <i>He will relay the request to Construction Division staff. Since the changes are minor, he does not think it will change the timeline or budget.</i></p> <p>BBibeau: Since the bidding process is lengthy, concerned that funding the project within this fiscal year may take over the deadline; which then puts project funding in jeopardy; therefore, an extension should be sought now.</p> <p>JC: Does not expect the process to exceed the deadline. Has reminded Division Chiefs that, as the M-DPW B/P Coordinator, all projects need his review for b/p considerations. He does not want another Venetian Cswy.-type problem (where the resurfacing project was put out to bid without striping the shoulders as bike lanes.)</p>
GO BOND	-	<p>TS: Suggested members to visit the website listed in the Agenda, to make an educated</p>

UPDATE		decision when voting for individual sections.
MEMBER COMMENTS	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC: He was able to redesign a resurfacing project along westbound SW 104 St., from 132-137 Aves, to restripe the right-hand lane as 14' (to better accommodate cyclists.) <p>NC: Inquired if the eastbound section will be narrowed to accommodate this change.</p> <p>JC: Additional width will be provided by taking 1' from the adjacent westbound lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SB: Handed-out a brochure regarding a cyclist from Chicago, representing an organization called Aspire to Inspire. His "Continental Pedal" will be cycling alone within 22 countries, for 280 days on behalf of several charities. He rode through Miami today, and will be coming back soon (from Key West). He will be staying overnight at her house. He represents many charities in order to appeal to various interests. He is keeping a BLOG, commenting on communities' bike-abilities. She is anxious to see what he writes about Miami. He rides 80-100 miles/day. He has support from a nutritionalist who ships him meals, etc. He will be riding to Naples on Sunday. <p>AL: Inquired what route he will take. He rode to Naples last month. Half of the Hwy 41 corridor (Naples to Sarasota) has bike lanes, including the whole city of Ft. Meyers. The section in Miami-Dade seemed too daunting, so he took Hwy 27 to (south of) Lake Okeechobee. However, there isn't a way to cross the state at that point. Some roads are 1-way and truckers are intimidating.</p> <p>TS: There is a preferred route in that area.</p> <p>DH: There is a shoulder on Tamiami Trail only from Krome Av. to the County Line.</p>

- The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.*